UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,144	02/17/2004	Aaron Sauve	307917.01	2246

22971 7590 09/05/2008

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER
KIM, JUNG W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2132	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/05/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com
ntovar@microsoft.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/780,144	SAUVE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JUNG KIM	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 March 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26,28,29,31,33,36-56 and 58-66* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26,28,29,31,33,36-56 and 58-66* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to the amendment filed on 3/26/08.

2. Claims 1-26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 36-56 and 58-66 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the amended independent claims have been considered but are not persuasive.

4. Applicant argues on pg. 14 of the Remarks that the prior art does not disclose the new limitation "wherein the object does not include a downloadable security profile, generated by an external content inspection engine, attached thereto, and assessing at the client device … which of plural trust levels to be accorded to the object without using or generating the downloadable security profile." This argument is not persuasive because Touboul '844 discloses that when a downloadable object does not include a downloadable security profile (DSP) generated by an external content inspection engine, the DSP is generated locally within the computer client, and a trust level for the object is ascertained using the locally generated DSP (col. 5, lines 25-33). Hence, Touboul discloses an embodiment wherein a trust level is accorded to an object without using a DSP generated by an external content inspection engine or without generating a DSP by an external content inspection engine. Therefore, Touboul discloses the new limitation in question.

5. Applicant's arguments that the prior art does not disclose the modeless prompt including a description of the object being suppressed (Remarks, pgs. 15-16) are not persuasive because it is notoriously well known in the art to provide a description of an action to a user with a modeless prompt. Examples abound: modeless prompts describing status and actions have been a part of GUI-based OS systems from their inception. The basic rational for providing a description with a modeless prompt is that it informs the user 1) an action was taken and 2) what the action was. Furthermore, a modeless prompt that is displayed when an object is suppressed without any description of the object being suppressed is analogous to an alert of a situation without providing any description of the situation; in both scenarios, a message that identified what has occurred enables the receiver of the prompt or alert to properly react to the prompt or alert. Hence, a modeless prompt actuated by a suppression of an objection, wherein the modeless prompt providing a description of the object is an obvious limitation in view of the prior art of record.

6. Applicant's remaining arguments are duplicative of those discussed above; hence, the claims remain rejected under the prior art of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Touboul et al. USPN 6,154,844 (hereinafter Touboul '844). (Touboul USPN 6,167,520 [hereinafter Touboul '520] is incorporated herein as including features further describing

the computer protection engine [Reference No. 180] of Touboul '844 [see Touboul '844, col. 5:42-46])

8. As per claim 1, Touboul '844 discloses a method of displaying a web page at a client device, comprising: detecting an object associated with a web page at the client device, wherein the object does not include a downloadable security profile, generated by an external content inspection engine, attached thereto; assessing at the client device, as part of displaying the web page, which of plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object without using or generating the downloadable security profile; and suppressing the object based on the accorded trust level (col. 5:14-33; 7:41-8:36); wherein assessing which of the plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object evaluates criteria, as part of displaying the web page, based on a content, source, or action of the object and wherein the assessing is performed on the client device on which the web page is displayed. (8:8-16; fig. 1, reference no. 180)

9. As per claim 2, Touboul '844 further discloses wherein the object is one of a COM object or an ActiveX control. (col. 1:62-65)

10. As per claim 3, Touboul '844 further discloses wherein the object is embedded in the web page, and includes any one of downloadable code, a link to a URL, a popup window, graphic data, a video file, an audio file, and a text file. (col. 1:62-65)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844.

12. As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Touboul '844 is incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, Touboul '844 discloses the object includes any one of downloadable code, a URL, a popup window, graphic data, a video file, an audio file, and a text file. (col. 1:62-65) Touboul '844 does not disclose the object is a link to an object on a remote server. However, it is notoriously well known for objects to be incorporated into an html web page as a link to an object on a remote server. For example, the HTML specification defines an object tag to incorporate a remote object into a web page via a URI attribute to indicate the location of the object. This feature enables, inter alia, logical and physical separation of the parts of a web page, which allows efficient uploading of the portions of the web page specific to the type of information. Examiner takes Official notice of this teaching. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the object to be a link to an object on a remote server. One would be motivated to do so to implement good design fundamentals into the invention, including scalability and separation of concerns. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 4.

13. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Donohue USPN 6,202,207 (hereinafter Donohue) and Pennell et al. US Patent Application Publication No. 20030098883. (hereinafter Pennell)

14. As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Touboul '844 is incorporated herein. Touboul '944 further discloses wherein assessing which of the plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object evaluates criteria, as party of displaying the web page, including whether the object is from a trusted source and whether a download flag is set. (col. 7:49-53; 10:14-24) Touboul '844 does not disclose the criteria includes whether the object is to upgrade an existing object. Donohue discloses a method for updating software, including accessing a web site to download resources to update versions of a software, downloading the resources, verifying the resources and building the updated version, wherein verification step includes verifying the signature of the downloaded resource, verifying allowable growth paths from the current to the updated versions based on license restrictions, and verifying other authentication information including password and/or a database usage parameter value. Col. 10:16-12:48. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the criteria to include whether the object is to upgrade an existing object, since this ensures that only trusted resources are used to upgrade an existing object. Donohue, 10:50-58.

15. Moreover, Touboul '844 does not disclose the step of suppressing the object includes displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon a

positive evaluation of any of the criteria. Pennell discloses a method for blocking "bad" windows and displaying "good" windows, wherein a window analyzer identifies whether a window is "good" or "bad" based on a list having characteristics of the window, including the source of the window (paragraph 0043), and wherein when a "bad" window is identified, blocking the window and displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the window based on this identification. (paragraph 0081) It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the step of suppressing the object to include displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon the positive evaluation of any of the criteria. One would be motivated to do so for a user-friendly manner of informing the user of a preventive measure by the invention. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 5.

16. As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Donohue and Pennell is incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the prompt is a modal prompt to provide a user with an activation choice. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, last sentence).

17. As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Donohue and Pennell is incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and providing a description of the object being suppressed. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, 5th, 6th sentence) Furthermore, it is notoriously well known in the art to

provide a description of an action to the user with a modeless prompt. Examples abound: modeless prompts describing status and actions have been a part of GUI-based OS systems from their inception. The basic rational for providing a description with a modeless prompt is that it informs the user 1) an action was taken and 2) what the action was. Furthermore, a modeless prompt that is displayed when an object is suppressed without any description of the object being suppressed is analogous to an alert of a situation without any description of the situation; in both scenarios, a message that identified what has occurred enables the receiver of the prompt or alert to properly react to the prompt or alert. Official Notice of this teaching is taken. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the modeless prompt to provide a description of the object being suppressed. One would be motivated to do so to provide the user with a more user-friendly experience as known to one of ordinary skill in the art. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 7.

18. As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Donohue and Pennell is incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with a subsequent activation choice. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, 5th, 6th sentence)

19. Claims 9-26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 36-56 and 58-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Pennell.

20. As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Touboul '844 is incorporated herein. In addition, Touboul '844 discloses the step of assessing which of the plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object evaluates criteria including whether the object is to be rendered and whether a download flag is set. (col. 10:14-24; downloadable is an applet or ActiveX control) Touboul '844 does not disclose the step of suppressing the object includes displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon a positive evaluation of any of the criteria. Pennell discloses a method for blocking "bad" windows and displaying "good" windows, wherein a window analyzer identifies whether a window is "good" or "bad" based on a list having characteristics of the window, including the source of the window (paragraph 0043), and wherein when a "bad" window is identified, blocking the window and displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the window based on this identification. (paragraph 0081) It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the step of suppressing the object to include displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon the positive evaluation of any of the criteria. One would be motivated to do so for a user-friendly manner of informing the user of a preventive measure by the invention. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 9.

21. As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Pennell is incorporated herein. (supra) In

addition, the prompt is a modal prompt to provide a user with an activation choice. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, last sentence).

22. As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Pennell is incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, 5th sentence)

23. As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Pennell is incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with a subsequent activation choice. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, 5th and 6th sentence)

24. As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Touboul '844 is incorporated herein. Touboul '844 does not disclose the step of assessing which of the plurality of trust levels is to be accorded to the object is based on whether the object is a popup window, and the step of suppressing the object includes displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon a positive determination. Pennell discloses it is desirous to block certain popup windows to prevent annoyances to a user browsing experience and discloses a method for blocking "bad" popup windows and displaying "good" popup windows, wherein a window

analyzer identifies whether a window is "good" or "bad" based on a list having characteristics of the window, including the source of the window (paragraphs 0006-0008 and 0043), and wherein when a "bad" window is identified, blocking the window and displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the window based upon a positive determination. (paragraph 0081) It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the step of assessing which of the plurality of trust levels is to be accorded to the object is based on whether the object is a popup window, and the step of suppressing the object includes displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon a positive determination. One would be motivated to do so to block unwanted popups from cluttering the screen and for generating a user-friendly manner of informing the user of a preventive measure by the invention. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 13.

25. As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Pennell is incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, 5th sentence)

26. As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Pennell is incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being

suppressed and to provide the user with an activation choice. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, 5th and 6th sentence)

27. As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Touboul '844 is incorporated herein. Touboul '844 further discloses the step of assessing which of the plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object evaluates criteria including whether the object is beneath a security setting and whether a security setting flag is set (col. 7:49-51; 8:6-16) Touboul '844 does not disclose the step of suppressing the object includes displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon a positive evaluation of any of the criteria. Pennell discloses a method for blocking "bad" windows and displaying "good" windows, wherein a window analyzer identifies whether a window is "good" or "bad" based on a list having characteristics of the window, including the source of the window (paragraph 0043), and wherein when a "bad" window is identified, blocking the window and displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the window based on this identification. (paragraph 0081) It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the step of suppressing the object to include displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon the positive evaluation of any of the criteria. One would be motivated to do so for a user-friendly manner of informing the user of a preventive measure by the invention. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 16.

28. As per claim 17, the rejection of claim 16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Pennell is incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the prompt is a modal prompt to provide a user with an activation choice. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, last sentence).

29. As per claim 18, the rejection of claim 16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Pennell is incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, 5th sentence)

30. As per claim 19, the rejection of claim 16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Pennell is incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with an activation choice. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, 5th and 6th sentence)

31. As per claim 20, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 is incorporated herein. Touboul '844 does not disclose the step of suppressing the object includes displaying a user interface to describe the content of the suppressed object and to provide a user with an opportunity to activate the content of the suppressed object. Pennell discloses a method for blocking "bad" windows and displaying "good" windows, wherein a window analyzer identifies whether

a window is "good" or "bad" based on a list having characteristics of the window, including the source of the window (paragraph 0043), and when a "bad" window is identified, blocking the window and displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the window based on this identification; this prompt includes a dialog box listing all the "bad" windows that have been blocked and clicking on a listed blocked window would then allow that window to be displayed. (paragraph 0081) It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the step of suppressing the object includes displaying a user interface to describe the content of the suppressed object and to provide a user with an opportunity to activate the content of the suppressed object. One would be motivated to do so for a user-friendly manner of informing the user of a preventive measure by the invention and allowing the user to override the action if the user deems the action unnecessary as disclosed by Pennell, ibid. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 20.

32. As per claims 21-24, the rejections of claims 1-4 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 are incorporated herein. Touboul '844 further discloses a computer-readable storage medium having one or more instructions that, when read, cause one or more processors on a client device to execute steps as recited in claims 1-4. (col. 5:34-46) Touboul '844 does not disclose executing the step of providing an activation opportunity for the action. Pennell discloses a method for blocking "bad" windows and displaying "good" windows, wherein a window analyzer identifies whether a window is "good" or "bad" based on a list having characteristics of the window,

including the source of the window (paragraph 0043), and wherein when a "bad" window is identified, blocking the window and displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the window based on this identification. In addition, the prompt provides a listing of all the blocked "bad" windows, wherein clicking on a listed blocked window would then allow that window to be displayed. (paragraph 0081) It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the step of suppressing the object to include displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon the positive evaluation of any of the criteria; wherein the activation opportunity comprises a user interface that displays a modeless prompt and describes the object being suppressed. One would be motivated to do so for a user-friendly manner of informing the user of a preventive measure by the invention and allowing the user to override the action if the user deems the action unnecessary as disclosed by Pennell, ibid.

33. In addition, it is notoriously well known in the art to provide a description of an action to the user with a modeless prompt. Examples abound: modeless prompts describing status and actions have been a part of GUI-based OS systems from their inception. The basic rational for providing a description with a modeless prompt is that it informs the user 1) an action was taken and 2) what the action was. Furthermore, a modeless prompt that is displayed when an object is suppressed without any description of the object being suppressed is analogous to an alert of a situation without any description of the situation-in both scenarios; in both scenarios, a message that identified what has occurred enables the receiver of the prompt or alert to properly react

to the prompt or alert. Official Notice of this teaching is taken. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the modeless prompt to provide a description of the object being suppressed. One would be motivated to do so to provide the user with a more user-friendly experience as known to one of ordinary skill in the art.

34. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 21-24.

35. As per claims 25 and 26, they are claims corresponding to claims 9-11, and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 9-11. Therefore, claims 25 and 26 are rejected as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Pennell for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 9-11.

36. As per claims 28, 29, 31 and 33, they are claims corresponding to claims 9-21, and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 9-21. Therefore, claims 28, 29, 31 and 33 are rejected as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Pennell for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 9-21.

37. As per claims 36-55, they are apparatus claims corresponding to claims 9-35, and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 9-35. Therefore, claims 36-55 are rejected as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Pennell for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 9-35.

38. As per claims 56 and 58-66, they are means claims covered by the disclosures discussed in the rejections of claims 9-55, and they do not teach or define above the information outlined in the rejections of claims 9-55. Therefore, claims 56 and 58-66 are rejected as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Pennell for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 9-55.

Conclusion

39. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Communications Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUNG KIM whose telephone number is (571)272-3804. The examiner can normally be reached on FLEX.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jung Kim/
Primary Examiner, AU 2132